(28)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (S) No. 2041 of 2007

Petitioner	:	Brijesh Kumar Pandey S/o- Late Nityanand Pandey Aged about 43 years Occupation- in charge license clerk, Municipal Corporation, Raigarh R/o.- Darogapara, Raigarh (C.G.)
	Versus	
Respondents		1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary Department of General Administration, D.K.S. Bhawan Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)
		2. Municipal Corporation Raigarh, Through Commissioner Municipal Corporation Raigarh (C.G.)

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri, J**

Present: Mr. Amit Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Vinay Pandey, Panel Lawyer for State/respondent No. 1.

ORDER

(Passed on this 3rd Day of April, 2007)

1. By this petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner seeks a direction to give the benefit of fixing revised pay-scale to the petitioner immediately after completing 12 years of service.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner joined in service in the year 1985 and he is entitled to revision of pay after completion of 12 years as per circular dated 25.4.2000 (Annexure P-2). He further submits that the said circular provides for grant of Kramonnati with effect from the order issued in his favour. According to the petitioner, he ought to have been given Kramonnati with effect from November, 1997 as others have been given.

(29)

3. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and perused the documents appended thereto. It is clear that the grant of Kramonnati would be effective from the date of order passed in favour of the employee. Since the order was passed on 1.8.2003 (Annexure P-1), whereunder the petitioner and three other were granted Kramonnati on the basis of recommendation made by the Kramonnati Samiti in its meeting dated 31.7.2003. Order dated 1.8.2003 is in accordance with the circular dated 25.4.2000. Thus, contention of the petitioner that it should be with effect from November, 1997 is without any basis. The order is just and proper and needs no interference.

4. Thus, the writ petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Subhash